

## REMARKS

### I. Introduction

At the time of the Office Action dated November 20, 2006, claims 1-9 were pending in this application. Of those claims, claims 7-9 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.142(b).

In this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended, claims 7-9 have been canceled, without prejudice, reserving right to prosecution in a continuation application. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to clarify the present invention. Claims 1-6 are now active in this application, of which claim 1 is independent.

### II. The Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because according to the Examiner, the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the claim limitations do not specifically disclose how to use a cell library database, and has no concrete result.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify the claimed invention to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider claim 1, as amended, and solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claim.

**III. The Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Furutani et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Furutani et al. describe a semiconductor memory device capable of correctly and surely effective voltage stress acceleration. In more detail, Furutani et al. describe applying voltage stress to each node of a memory to perform reliable memory screening at the time of shipment of the device.

In contrast, the claimed cell library database is used with a computer-aided logic circuit design system in designing an integrated circuit. Furutani et al. does not teach the claimed cell library database itself.

Based on the foregoing, Furutani et al. do not teach a cell library database including all the limitations recited in claims 1-6, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and favorable consideration thereof.

**IV. Conclusion**

Applicants believe that the imposed rejection has been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

**Application No.: 10/630,803**

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

  
Michael E. Fogarty  
Registration No. 36,139

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:TT  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: February 20, 2007**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080  
as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1348801-2.060188.0601